

Attorney Docket No.: 42390.P13063
Application No.: 10/038,409
Page 13

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 remain pending. The specification has been amended to resolve an inconsistency with Fig. 2. Claim 30 has been amended solely to correct its dependency.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-12 and 14-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Goronsky (EP 1022725 A1); and rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goronsky in view of Ellis et al. ("Tandem Acoustic Modeling in Large Vocabulary Recognition," IEEE Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing, 2001).

Claims 1, 18, and 28:

Applicant respectfully traverses the § 102(b) rejection of independent claims 1, 18, and 28 over Goronsky. Claims 1, 18, and 28, as amended, require a method, article of manufacture, and apparatus including, *inter alia*, "determin[ing] an identity of a speaker through a network over which output data including identification information is provided to one or more speech-recognition systems." Goronsky fails to disclose at least the above quoted element of independent claims 1, 18, and 28.

Col. 3, lines 39-46, of Goronsky appears to disclose converting an analog signal from a microphone 1 into a digital signal by A/D stage 2, followed by feature extraction by module 3 to obtain a feature vector. Verification module 4 appears to identify the speaker based on this feature vector. By contrast, claims 1, 18, and 28 require "determin[ing] an identity of a speaker through a network . . ." Neither microphone 1 nor A/D stage 2 reasonably disclose a "network,"

Attorney Docket No.: 42390.P13063
Application No.: 10/038,409
Page 14

and thus Goronsky fails to disclose "determin[ing] an identity of a speaker through a network," as set forth in claims 1, 18, and 28.

Because Goronsky does not disclose a network, it also fails to disclose providing "output data including identification information" over the network, as set forth in claims 1, 18, and 28. For at least these reasons, Goronsky fails to disclose all elements of independent claims 1, 18, and 28. The § 102(b) rejection of these claims is improper and should be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 2-12, 14, and 18-30 are allowable at least by virtue of their respective dependence from claims 1, 18, and 28.

Claim 15:

Applicant respectfully traverses the § 102(b) rejection of independent claim 15 over Goronsky. Claim 15 requires a method including, *inter alia*, "accessing by a speaker a network containing a speech recognition system." Goronsky fails to disclose at least the above quoted element of independent claim 15.

As explained above with regard to claims 1, 18, and 28, Goronsky does not disclose a network. As is clear from col. 3, lines 27-30, Fig. 1 of Goronsky discloses only "a speech recognition system," and not "a network containing a speech recognition system," as set forth in claim 15. Thus, Goronsky fails to disclose accessing such a network by a speaker, as required by claim 15.

Dependent claims 16 and 17 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 15.

Mar-01-2004 05:03pm From-LF3 OFFICE AREA

7036333303

T-482 P.003/003 F-722

Attorney Docket No.: 42390.P13063
Application No.: 10/038,409
Page 15

Regarding dependent claim 13, the addition of Ellis et al., even if proper, fails to cure the deficiencies of Goronsky explained above. Ellis et al. also fails to teach or suggest the above-quoted element of the method recited in independent claim 1. The Office Action does not allege that Ellis et al. teaches or suggests the claim element at issue. Hence, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established for dependent claim 13, because the combination of references fails to teach or suggest all elements of this dependent claim.

Applicant submits that claims 1-30 are allowable over the applied art. Reconsideration and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

In the event that any outstanding matters remain in this application, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact Alan Pedersen-Giles, attorney for Applicant, at the number below to discuss such matters.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 02-2666 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 1, 2004



Alan Pedersen-Giles
Registration No. 39,996

Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman LLP
12400 Wilshire Blvd., Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030
(703) 633-1061